DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 125 24 SP 004 753

AUTHOR	Lierheimer, Alvin P.
TITLE	Parsing the Paradox: Assuring Quality in School Personnel Preparation.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Communication (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0490
PUB DATE	71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080490-3706(010)
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Certification, Performance Criteria, School Personnel, *Standards, *Teacher Certification, *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Despite recent calls for changes in teacher certification, there are many questions to be considered before changes are made. Some of these questions are: What are the basic qualities and abilities that a teacher must have? Who will decide on these qualities and abilities? How will they be measured? Who needs to be certified? The trend toward accountability and performance criteria for certification is an encouraging step, but it is just a step. Such an approach needs further consideration in order to develop a rationale and workable procedures. Another change being demanded is to give teachers control over entry into the profession. This too is a good idea, but before teachers can be given such control they must present a feasible plan. There are many other problems and paradoxes which complicate the issue of teacher certification, such as the conflict between human and intellectual values, student attitudes toward education, and efforts to recruit minority group members into teaching while still maintaining high standards. (RT)

Quality in School Personnel
Preparation

ED048125

PARSING THE PARADOX:
ASSURING QUALITY IN SCHOOL PERSONNEL PREPARATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by
Dr. Alvin P. Lierheimer
Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

Published by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators, national affiliate of the National Education Association; National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association

March 1971

SP 004 753

SP004753

Foreword

New alignments in education made the topic of this paper very significant: "determining who decides on what, for whom, and how!" in teacher certification (Lierheimer's words). Certification is the portal to the profession; non-certification is the exit. This, then, is a topic of crucial importance; it gets at the essence of efforts to improve education: placing professionally and personally sound people in the schools and keeping only the best ones there!

The author has long been in the forefront among leaders seeking new approaches in New York and between the states. Publication of his monograph does not constitute an endorsement of his viewpoints. Our intent is to promote study and discussion of certification alternatives. We are pleased to make a contribution to the literature.

Readers hopefuily will use this publication as a concise point of departure. We encourage utilization of ERIC tools in such efforts. The descriptor (index term) most likely to lead to citations (abstracts in Research in Education and annotations in Current Index to Journals in Education) on this subject is TEACHER CERTIFICATION. For readers uncertain how to use ERIC capabilities effectively, we recommend the following which are available in microfiche and hardcopy through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (a) How To Conduct a Search Through ERIC, ED 036 499, microfiche, 65¢; hard-copy, $3.29; (b) Instructional Materials on Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Part Two. Information Sheets on ERIC, ED 043 580, microfiche, 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29. Item "b" is available as a complimentary item, while the supply lasts, from this Clearinghouse. Instructions for ordering ERIC materials are given in "Ordering Information" which follows.

We hope that our expectations for this publication are fulfilled: that you will understand the topic better and that you will use ERIC as a tool to deepen your understanding in the days ahead.

Joel L. Burdin
Director

March 1971

About ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published or unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training, funds, and general services to the 20 clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators, a national affiliate of the National Education Association, and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of NEA. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision-making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and inservice preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.

Ordering Information

Documents cannot be ordered without an "ED" or order number. The "ED" number is listed with each citation. Once the reader has the "ED" number, he must order the document directly from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), 4827 Rugby Avenue , Bethesda, Md. 20014.

To determine the cost of a document, the reader should look at "EDRS Price" or "Publisher's Price" in the citation. Information such as "EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29" means that the document may be obtained from EDRS in microfiche (MF) for 65 cents or in "hardcopy" for $3.29. A microfiche is a 4 by 6-inch form containing images of the pages of the documents, as many as 60 pages per fiche, each image representing a standard-sized sheet of paper. Microfiche readers, available from many manufacturers, are required to enlarge the images for reading purposes. Hardcopy prints are black and white 6 by 9-inch pages.

Payment to EDRS must accompany orders totaling less than $10.00. Applicable local state sales tax should be added to orders or a tax exemption certificate should be submitted.

If an individual or institution would like to subscribe to RIE, a check or money order should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The domestic rate is $21 per year; foreign, $26.25. Single issues sell for $1.75.

ORDER BLANK

(Detailed information on how to order ERIC documents appears above.)

Send to:
ERIC Document Reproduction Service
4827 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Cut this out and send with your order.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP _____

Quantity	ED number	Title	HC Price	MF Price
		Total $		

Parsing the Paradox:
Assuring Quality in School Personnel Preparation

We educate to satisfy man's curiosity; yet the more we educate, the more dissatisfied we become.

Why is there such a restless dissatisfaction with present schemes of teacher certification when generations of such-certified teachers have presided over classrooms that produced men who walked on the moon, men who conquered polio? Hasn't our present teaching arrangement permitted us to educate a larger percentage of the population than any other country? Could the dissatisfaction be that these same teachers have also educated the world's leading consumers of LSD and men who perpetuate racism? Is our dissatisfaction because clearly desired objectives are only dimly and drearily achieved?

These are only a few of the paradoxes in our educational world. An examination of the structure of teacher certification might illuminate why we are, and should be, concerned with the legalism of certification of professional personnel. Such an examination, too, may help us assess the usefulness of schemes proposed for setting standards of entrance into the education profession.

Our concepts collide with our language in that very word "profession." What other profession thinks in terms of so many individuals doing so many different tasks? Almost one teacher for every 30 children plus a varied assortment of supervisors, helpers, principals, and others. Is it not unrealistic to think of one certification scheme that covers all teachers--and our system of course-counting or its corallary of program-approval are basically the same. The very word "teacher" implies a person who is expected to be diagnostician, therapist, and pathologist for all the children, and the state of health of the children may be organic or psychic or both! What other licensed profession is so heavily unionized? In the public mind, the granting of primary control over admission and practice as well as employment may represent a double exclusivity analogous to the singularity of the telephone industry in the field of communication. But that total monopoly is tempered by an independent rate-setting body.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE

If the charge is to look at the "state of the art" in assuring quality in the preparation of school personnel, the title of this piece describes the problem in brief. What follows, therefore, is not a new device for arriving at assurances of quality in the preparation of school personnel but rather some questions that should be considered as we examine any model offered for attesting to the quality of personnel who expect to teach our children.

Defined in its crudest terms, the certification of teachers is determining who decides on what, for whom, and how!

What is it that we are deciding about--the teacher's knowledge, his skill in conveying knowledge, his skill in educing learning on the part of the student? Or are we deciding on the personal qualities of warmth, integrity, creativity which serve as an example to the student. And if it is all of these, how much of each?

When we have determined what it is that we are attesting to by an act of certification, we must also ask how such a judgment is to be reached. Certainly there is a difference whether such a judgment is mainly intuitive. If so, whose intuition? Or if it is the sum of empirical decisions, what is the rational basis for such decision? And if it is both of these, how much of each?

When one asks how a decision about certification is reached, one also must ask who makes it. Are teachers themselves the best judge of quality in the preparation of other teachers? Or are teachers educators with a lifetime of experience in preparation itself better judges? Are those who are required to pay the freight entitled to pass judgment on quality of performance? If it were possible to determine, the results of a certification scheme would be valued in terms of differences in the performance of students.

Finally in our definition of certification, we should agree on the audience for whom certification is intended. Does everyone in a school building need to be certified? Does the scout leader talking with a youngster about the math needed for his merit badge function as a teacher and therefore need to be certified? Of if not, is it only because he doesn't serve between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m.? Should we go to the other extreme and say that only an educational manager in each school should be certified as to the quality of his performance and his primary performance should be the ability to employ persons able to contribute effectively to the school's objectives?

There are critics who will add one more question to the definition of certification. "Why should we have certification?" Why not simply let those who are able and willing serve in the schools. But unless society were to abandon all confidence in the history of the ages, requirements would be set by someone. Better to do it openly with as careful analysis as current thinking permits. The critic who asks why have certification at all usually conceals the requirement he has in mind which is "someone like me."

PARADOXES REVISITED

Before looking more closely at the elements of a teacher certification scheme, it may be instructive to examine some of the paradoxes that serve as a social backdrop.

We live in a country of contrasts--a land where affluence has reached unimagined proportions judging by the pages of resort cruises advertised in the *New York Times*, the power-packed stallions of Detroit, or the stereo amplification whose capacity surpasses that of the human ear. Yet the same land hears cries of dissent unimagined in another area. In a land where everyone despises war, the display of a peace symbol is considered indicative of a disruptive minority. In a city whose chief newspaper carries a regular page on gourmet cooking, so many children come to school hungry that the schools themselves must feed them breakfast. In a land where telephone lines provide access to a miraculous world-wide airline reservation scheme, there is an annoying number of machine-induced wrong numbers in regular commercial service.

Our problems with ambiguity in education are to be seen within this larger setting; they are not isolated phenomena symptomatic of an unhealthy portion of our society. What plagues us in teacher certification is a reflection of the serious concerns that do, and should, exist in many other areas.

Consider some puzzling contrasts in teacher certification:

1. The call for change in certification styles by persons outside education proposes far different solutions than does the stirring for change among those already certified, yet neither group gives persistent, analytical thought in depth to the problem.
2. We are surrounded by a world of informal learning--television, friends, self-teaching, libraries, museums--yet our thoughts about certifying teachers suggest that all learning takes place under a teacher in the school.
3. Within the education profession, there are significant strides in developing behaviorally-stated performance criteria for teaching; yet this refinement comes at a time when young people who will enter the profession condemn the lockstep inhumanity of our educational institutions. Movement in teacher education seems purposelessly peristaltic, relentlessly overcome by labrynthian schemes for accomplishing the unimportant.
4. There is increased pressure for professional control over admission to the practice of teaching yet this movement comes at a time when public confidence in educators is waning, when the supply of teachers appears to be more adequate than ever before. In a period of short supply, teachers as a scarce commodity had a better chance to call the tune than they may have when the supply of teachers is, and promises to remain, more adequate.
5. Instead of creating a certification scheme that permits all persons to teach who can help children reach the important objectives of a formal education, we continue to build onto a system that is primarily designed to reject the incapable. And for a profession whose business is testing, it is puzzling indeed that tests for teaching proficiency are leprously eschewed!
6. Certification of teachers has perpetually sought a uniform method for arriving at decisions for admittedly non-uniform schools, children, and educational objectives.

In education, as in so many other social endeavors, we strive with increasing sophistication, yet judging by our unhappiness with the state of things, our Sisyphean efforts never achieve success. We readily demean our present methods of certification by course completion although there is at least some justification in thinking that people act with reference to what they were taught. It is almost a badge of honor to be dissatisfied with social conditions and services. Every month, magazines exultantly expose the calamitous deficiencies of medical services to the aged and the poor, the hobbling complexities of the law that deprive justice for those who need it, the shameful lack of support of current grading practices, the relevancy of a classical curriculum, the successful articulation of research and teaching on the part of graduate professors. Is there such joy in the dreary litany of our inadequacies that we must celebrate continually about the cauldron of despair?

CERTIFICATION AS A SOCIAL ISSUE

It becomes impossible to talk about the certification of teachers without thinking about the larger social setting in which teachers operate or without considering the specific problems of the schools. And here the issue is not only one of purpose and consequence as Charles Silberman elaborates

so instructively in his opening chapter of *Crisis in the Classroom* but also the mundane question of constraints imposed upon the schools in which teachers operate.

Silberman views education "as the deliberate or purposeful creation, evocation, or transmission of knowledge, abilities, skills, and values."[1] And each of these words has been carefully selected for inclusion. He elaborates particularly on the very last word as he reminds us that, i.e., "education is inescapably a moral as well as an intellectual and esthetic enterprise." It is this element in teaching, and in preparation for teaching, that happily upsets our patented schemes whether they be the long-entrenched system of completing a program of college courses or the new pedagogy of systems-analysis such as permeates the model elementary programs sponsored since 1967 by the United States Office of Education.

But even if we restrict our thinking to the schools as we know them and to teachers we expect to find "doing their thing" in various classrooms, there are constraints at work for which certification cannot be held responsible and which changes in licensing schemes will not affect. What a given community believes to be the objectives of its schools is fundamental, yet how many school districts give serious and sustained thought to writing, in understandable and descriptive terms--what it is that the people expect of their schools. "Oh, that's the teachers job!" But is it? Teachers as a group may be able to tell what can and can't be done or how well. The determination of purposes, however, is too broad and serious a responsibility to leave to teachers. There is a distasteful analogy in civilian control over the military. The military are expected to act with all professional skill, but in determining objectives, the decisions, at least in theory, are vested in civilian authority.

And it is important how these objectives and purposes of the school are determined, whether they represent a set of statements prepared by an assistant superintendent and presented to a desultory meeting of taxpayers or whether they are field-grown concepts adequately representative of the school's community.

Even with an understandable statement of objectives, well-educated teachers may not be able to design and staff an instructional program to achieve these goals. What if fiscal constraints make such achievement impossible, what if the principals give only surface commitment to the goals, what if state regulations lag far enough behind good practice to discourage practitioners from successfully addressing the goals, what if there is inadequate agreement on assessment devices, on telling whether or not the school's objectives are being met? To hold teachers alone accountable for success or failure calls for assurance that all other conditions are supportive. This is seldom the case.

Placing blame for failure has always been easier and more popular than has the reconstruction of authority to rectify a problem. It is simple-minded

---

[1]Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 6.

to think that a change in mere certification rules will have a profound effect upon the product of the schools unless other critical elements that affect that product are also improved. However, to disclaim full responsibility is not to recognize that change must begin someplace. In the movements to improve schemes to attest to the competence of educational professionals, there is at least a significant beginning. One can hope that other publics will similarly address themselves to "the remaking of American education" as Silberman subtitles his book, that they will be as concerned with the purposes of the schools, with their support, and with making them a happy, inspiring environment for self development, for growth in awareness of self and society.

CURRENT EFFORTS TO CHANGE CERTIFICATION

Since state governments are the basic instrumentality of education and have a history of establishing criteria for entrance to teaching, it is understandable that the movement to develop basic changes in certification has arisen in several states and has, since about 1968, gathered considerable momentum. The movement is partly attributable to the restlessness about all matters academic--admission, curriculum, and grading. There are, indeed, few defenders of certification on the basis of course completion. One senses, however, a certain smugness among the established professors and practitioners which implies "we've looked for other ways and haven't found anything better." Dissatisfaction with college courses as a basis for certification is indeed nothing new. Educational groups have wrestled with the problem for many years but never with significant improvement rather, despairingly, just with changes in the course arrangements. A new scheme in an article or a speech is a far cry from implementation on a broad enough basis to have impact. How long and how much money, for example, did it take American Airlines to go from concept and design to operation of its computer system of reservations?

In the State of Washington there were discussions through the late 1960's about a "performance-based" certification scheme, and steps were taken to develop and implement such an arrangement with the schools and colleges. But the system appears to illustrate faith beyond understanding. And such a judgment is not said in derogation. Had not the State of Washington changed its teacher certification style, few others would have been encouraged to entertain similar notions. But the answers aren't all in.

In Texas, federal funds have made new consortiums possible in the training of teachers with the orientation around a demonstration of competence as well as shared responsibility among school, college, and other agencies. Less appears in print about the purposes for which competence will be developed or the consequences of alternative teacher training strategies that might be developed. But cooperative movement is evident even if the direction isn't clear.

Basic changes are also underway in New York and in Florida although it is even less clear in either state what will develop. The agitated state of dissatisfaction with current methods and responsibilities and the potential for developing viable alternatives give some confidence that forward movement will result.

There were serious changes in certification rules in the recent California adoption of Assembly Bill 122, a bill that broke some of the constraints on the schools in their employment of personnel. The federal Teacher Corps, fearing

it might be left behind, leaped onto the performance-based certification bandwagon by declaring that all its programs would henceforth require specified competencies. The Office of Education-sponsored model elementary education teacher preparation programs contain significant elements of a competence-based approach to teacher education and certification which tie specific teaching behaviors to training modules so that the teacher can proceed with training at his own speed.

Further evidence of change in licensure may also be seen in the attempts to establish a national commission on reform in licensing of educational personnel, an independent and authoritative group with the capability of developing model certification legislation and advising on the merits of statewide proposals for licensure change.

There are several questions about all these efforts toward change in teacher education and certification: What are the reasons for the changes and what are the consequences? It is insufficient to say simply that the reason for change is to improve teaching. What kind of improvement? Better knowledge of content, more skill in handling content, increased ability to discriminate among kinds of knowledge and skill, increased ability to make value-choices about what to learn? And will these changes result in students better able to manipulate data, to respond intelligently and with concern to inquiries about their world? Will these changes result in students able to perpetuate and direct their own education in fulfillment of themselves and their society?

An additional aspect of change in certification concerns the intensified effort by organized groups of teachers to gain dominance over determinations about licensure itself. Professional autonomy or self-governance, as it is called, has a literature of its own. There is little substantive elaboration of how determinations would be made about qualifications to teach should the organized profession be given a decision-making role. With a certain amount of breast-beating, the literature argues that teachers and others should make the rules governing admission to teaching and the practice of teaching, but it says little about the mechanisms or the principles that would guide the decision-making process about certification.

Easily forgotten in the discussion about certification of persons to work in the schools is the differentiation between licensure and employment. Many of the elaborate schemes to determine competence to teach leave no room for the possibility of education as an art rather than a science. Inadmissible is the possibility that some persons of unusual temperament, values, and background might serve as a teacher because of what they are rather than because of what they can do. Certification should be regarded as permission to be employed and should state its limitations in only the broadest terms. Whether or not a given individual is equipped to serve in a particular school will depend not only on that individual's interests, capacities, and motivation but also upon the goals of the schools, the characteristics of the school, and its pupil population--the stylistic or bureaucratic constraints that may be imposed from outside the teaching force itself.

What is the role of the state in certification? Shall it impose no requirements and leave the decision entirely up to the local school? Shall it impose the broadest and barest minima, e.g., a college degree and then

helplessly face the question of why a degree? Shall the state impose process standards on a local district saying "in determining certification standards for persons who work in your schools, you must involve the constituent populations broadly and purposefully." These puzzling questions have few helpful analogies in other professions. The teaching profession has certain uniquenesses: It is an extremely large body; it negotiates collectively conditions of employment and service; almost all its members are employed by a public agency; its members gain a tenured relationship to the job that bears only lightly on continuing performance; some of its tasks can and are done by persons without training. These and other characteristics of the teaching profession make it difficult to find analagous professions from which to pattern licensure methodology.

It may be more helpful at this point to raise topics for consideration in the matter of certification schemes rather than attempt to describe a model which answers all our current needs. It is unlikely that there is a perfect model, an ideal way by which competence in the classroom can be assured at the state level. Therefore an analysis of the chief ingredients might serve as a viewing device for proposed schemes. Such a framework will always be incomplete.

WHAT IS IT WE'RE CERTIFYING?

What are the necessary and desirable characteristics for someone who will work as the principal instructional person in a classroom? What kind of work-performance behaviors will be expected of this person? What are the goals which the school has set and which it wishes accomplished? Are these objectives stated in a way that one can determine when and how well they are being achieved?

What knowledge, skills, and activities on the part of the teacher are necessary to accomplish these objectives? Is it important to have a person schooled in modern European history, in calculus, in the dramatic arts? Must the teacher also be a practicing historian, a mathematician, an artist to accomplish the school's goals? What are the knowledge ingredients a teacher must possess to demonstrate a capacity to educe historical, mathematical, or artistic learning on the part of the student? Which of these ingredients are affected by the age of the student? To what extent is the success of the teacher's performance judged by the outcomes on the part of students, e.g., increases in grade-level? What other signs will be taken as evidence of success attributable to the teacher? Will the stimulation of serendipitous learning be credited to the teacher? What changes in attitudes, values, feelings will be given credit? If it is true that what the teacher is may be more important than what the teacher does, what characteristics of being will be required for persons working in the classroom? Will they differ according to the age of the student? Will they be different for persons who work with handicapped youngsters? What level of self-awareness will be a minimum requirement, and how will it be stated and determined?

What abilities for working with parents will be required of persons who work with children? What community relations understandings are necessary to work effectively with children, e.g., understanding of variant life-styles, comprehension of language and cultural patterns.

Teaching is not simply leading the student to learn what has been determined to be important. Teaching is orchestrating the varying elements in a given situation--the child with his inborn characteristics as well as those he brought from home this morning, the subject with its historical relevance or contemporary irrelevance, the other students and their variables, the teacher with his likes, dislikes, prejudices, strengths, interests, emotions, talents. This mix doesn't remain still. In deciding on the abilities for a teacher to be certified, what standards will be used to determine an ability to orchestrate without losing sight of objectives?

HOW ARE CERTIFICATION STANDARDS TO BE INVOKED?

Every little "what" has a "how" all its own, to rudely paraphrase an old tune. For every element that one seeks to require of a teacher, there must be a way of determining with some consistency the degree to which it is present or absent. We will never be permitted the luxury of allowing only those persons to work in a classroom who are totally fit on all points of whatever scale we construct. Not only are we unlikely to construct such a scale which is acceptable but the numbers of children alone insist that we continue to engage those who are less than perfect as indeed we do in every profession.

Determining how the required competencies are to be assessed implies teacher training ingredients. It is not simply a question of whether given capacities, skills, and understandings are present in a prospective teacher; how are underdeveloped capacities, skills, and understandings strengthened or enlarged? Certification is a control-point that has been neglected in professional writing--it is seldom a subject of inquiry in schools of education themselves--yet this control point affects significantly the formal schooling of prospective teachers that precedes it and it affects how teachers function subsequently in the classroom. A change in certification rules has ramifications throughout the educational system.

There are ingredients in the certification of the classroom teacher that lend themselves to formal testing or verification by attendance in college courses. Does he know as much European history, mathematics, or art as a cross section of college majors? Does he know the key educative options that can be used in his subject or grade, i.e., does he know the artillery upon which he can call?

A second level of investigation in determining how well the prospective teacher can direct learning toward the goals and objectives of the schools can best be done in trial situations--brief classroom experiences, microteaching, simulation trials. To reach a determination at this level requires a respondent who can evaluate the answers with more subjectivity than is displayed in a paper pencil test of content. How effectively does the prospective teacher combine his knowledge of European history with his understanding of teaching methodology to capture and impress the young mind in terms of the school objectives? Does the trial situation expose the teacher's ability to educe learning on the part of the student?

A much longer experience and more detailed evaluation by alert, sensitive, and supportive personnel may be needed to make the continuing determination of how well the teacher is able to carry out the role assigned to him. A permanent form of licensure probably ought not to be issued until considerable

experience has been achieved and a more reliable judgment made about success in terms of objectives. How can an extended period of apprenticeship be used, then, to determine whether the teacher knows why he is teaching a certain subject in a certain way and whether he has considered alternative strategies with the consequences they might pose? Only an extended period will permit a determination that the teacher has the sustained spirit and concern for growing children which can make the classroom warm, responsive, and open without letting it become a mere public playground.

FOR WHOM MUST WE HAVE CERTIFICATION?

It has been commonly accepted that certification is a requirement imposed upon teachers. Sometimes "teachers" is defined as all educational personnel, but the use of a uniform term masks the question of what categories of personnel should be certified. Do we now certify as professionals, persons who do not act, as such nor feel they need to? Many people in classrooms today function in an instructional role that could be done by persons with far different training. Should certification be restricted to persons who serve as educational managers --persons whose task would be to see that the school's objectives were carried out in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner, using teaching machines, high school students, part-time employees from local business or industry, persons trained as teachers, without regard to certification? Such an arrangement would cut down the categories of persons who needed to be certified and would permit a concentration of attention, salary, and accountability on instructional managers.

There is another view that says "no living soul should come in contact with school children unless he is certified." Such an opinion sounds more financially self-serving than educationally justified. Must we certify the custodian who imparts the conventional wisdom to fifth graders helping him get a classroom set up?

Recent experience suggests that paraprofessional certification seeks to fence in the pasture and restrict the very mobility originally sought by adding such personnel to the schools. It is almost professionally instinctive to "raise" requirements, however, once a sufficient number are in a given field.

Realistically there is a middle ground that may be appropriate for these times but such a determination ought itself to be the subject of local consideration more than it is one of statewide legislation.

The categories for whom certification should apply ought to be carefully analyzed in terms of their contribution to the achievement of objectives and the sureness with which decisions on competence can be made. The very open education we seek for our children may indeed be fostered by a similar openness in engaging personnel to work with those children. It ought not to be necessary for an identical certification pattern to exist for every school in the state anymore than it is necessary or even desirable for an identical pattern of instruction to exist for all schools.

WHO MAKES DECISIONS ABOUT TEACHING REQUIREMENTS?

The organized teaching profession has expressed more dissatisfaction with the control over the process of certification than it has with the content, the purposes, the alternatives, or the means of determination. Professional literature refers to self-governance and professional autonomy as a necessity before acountability can be acknowledged. The president of the NEA reports that "most if not all of the possibilities for educational improvement are directly related to self-governance for the teaching profession."[2] But it is difficult to find in print from the organized profession how they would make certification determinations if they had the authority. Would they continue to depend on completion of courses of study at college? Or would they shift the basis to one of demonstrated competence before a panel of peers? And how would such a model work? One looks also for statements on certification from the organized profession which describe the meaning of certification and its relation to practice as it might become were the profession to have full control over its determination. Would certification stand for understanding, for performance, or both? Would examinations be used as they are in other professions? One of the reasons that acceptability lags for movement toward a larger role for the professional teacher in controlling decisions on certification is the absence of attention to these substantive issues in the certification process. Informed public opinion asks: "Why turn over so important a source of educational control until there is a clearer indication of how it will be handled?"

It is alleged that the bureaucracy that now controls certification in most states is unwilling to yield its power. Anyone who has worked in this swamp for years won't cry over the possibility of escape. The task of establishing certification rules and operating a program of certification is seldom supported satisfactorily. It is regarded as an insignificant clerical chore by the teachers who are the recipients of services and similarly regarded by the top administrative management which is responsible for its support. Cursed by one; misunderstood by the other!

There are outside critics who are convinced--and with some substantiating evidence--that the bureaucracy which controls certification at the state level is itself the pawn of the education establishment, whether that be the teachers' union, the college professors of education, or some other group. Both extremes undoubtedly exist, i.e., a state department reluctant to yield its power over certification determinations and a state agency dominated by old-line educators anxious to maintain the present status. Neither condition is justified.

But such criticism will not help us answer the question of who ought to have an influential role in making certification determinations. Even the most malevolent critics would not deny teachers a role. But neither is there public momentum to vest final authority for certification determinations in the hands of the organizationally minded teacher.

A general principle holds that those most affected by a decision should have most to say about that decision. But many categories of people are

---

[2]Helen Bain, "Self-Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 51:413; April 1970.

ultimately affected by a decision on the control point of teacher certification. Such action affects how teachers teach, how they are trained, and indeed how they are judged. A decision about certification ultimately affects the nature and quality of the educational service rendered to the student and to his family. A decision that so seriously affects the educational program is also of concern to the businessman who employs the product of the schools, to the college that accepts graduates for further education, to legislators who seek revenue to support both school programs and related programs in higher education. The administrator now charged with operating an educational program is also concerned with the standards which will determine what teachers work in his school and what competencies they can be expected to possess. Conversely, of course, the school teacher will be more than mildly interested in stated competencies for administrative positions.

No scheme to assign responsibility for determining certification standards will be fully acceptable to all the parties at interest. But neither is full acceptability the case in determination of our common laws or our administrative regulations. Should we not do the best we can in assuring a representation of interested parties with attention to those having the deepest interest? The use of public hearings can provide assurance that a small number of selected representatives are adequately advised on decisions that affect the quality of the schools. An appeal process can be established so that certification is responsive to new needs, to changing demands upon its structure and content.

CONCLUSION AND THEN SOME

In considering the many paradoxes that surround the central issue of certifying educational personnel, there are considerations, then, of content --what qualities are we attesting to; of form--how are the qualities assessed; of population--who needs to be certified; and finally of governance--who makes the decisions on the above factors? But blighting the neatness of such an analysis are queries that complicate life still further.

1. Will our best efforts to improve the certification as well as the service of teachers only enhance credentialism to the detriment of minority groups whose service in education is so desperately needed?
2. Will our stress on behavioral objectives, accountability, and the three heavenly domains--cognitive, affective, psychomotor--blind us to the humane values which might make life with each other more livable?
3. How will our best efforts at certification recognize the growing interest in independent learning and the increasing sophistication of technology that ultimately must find a viable role in educating young people?
4. What will be the effect of teachers drawn from today's colleges where "activities that reach students in ways that the academic work cannot are often activities which are profoundly inimical to the welfare of the university as a place for teaching and learning governed by the canons of inquiry and the rules of evidence and of logic."[3] The same author

---

[3]Martin Trow, "Admissions and the Crisis in Higher Education," *Higher Education for Everybody?* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 59-61.

also reminds us that "a serious interest in bookish studies is not present in the whole of the youthful population nor is it synonymous with intelligence or verbal skills and the capacity for abstract reasoning."[4]

The world is full of paradoxes and ambiguities. Living successfully among them requires either a glorious insensitivity, an arrogant confidence in simple answers, or a resilient determination to search relentlessly for better solutions. And it is in these terms that the paradoxes of teacher certification need to be viewed. We cannot ignore the problems of the present scheme. We cannot be satisfied that simplistic solutions will readily be invented when the problem has such complex and sweeping dimensions. But we can use our collective intelligence to devise the best possible scheme for assuring ourselves and others that the kind of education we want for our children is most likely to be provided by the personnel whom we engage for their formal instruction. And putting a premium on formal instruction does not belittle the importance of incidental learning. After all, what is icing without cake? That's another paradox itself!

---

[4] Ibid.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; Contract number OEC-0-8-080490-3706-(010). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.